36

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR.

(W.P.(S.) No.5452 of 2007.)

Petitioner		T.R. Sahu, aged 48 years, Son of Shri R.R. Sahu, Senior Co-operative Inspector, Office of Joint Registrar Co-operative Soc. Durg Tahsil and Distt. Durg (C.G.)
	Versus	
Respondents	1.	The State Government of Chhattisgarh, Through the Secretary, Co-operative Department Ministry, D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)
	2.	The Registrar, Co-operative Societies, Raipur (C.G.)
	3.	Shri Suresh Kumar Sarine, Senior Co-operative Inspector, (Audit Board), Office of Assistant Registrar, Cooperative Societies, Durg. (C.G.)

Writ Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India.

Appearance:-

Shri B.K. Chakraborty, counsel for the petitioner.
Shri A.S. Kachhawaha, Govt. Advocate for the State/respondents on advance copy.

ORAL ORDER
(18.09.2007)

SUNIL KUMAR SINHA, J.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is working on the post of Senior Co-operative Inspector at Durg and he is senior to respondent No.3 as per the gradation list dated 20.02.1998 (Annexure-P/2). According to this gradation list, name of the petitioner finds place at Sl. No.606, whereas the name of respondent No.3 finds place at Sl.No.620. He submits that respondent No.3 who is junior to him has been promoted to next higher post, whereas the petitioner has

37

not been promoted. His further submission is that in this connection, the petitioner has filed a representation dated 11.10.2006 (Annexure-P/4) before respondent No.2, but the same has not been decided so far. In the nut shell, submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that a person junior to him has been promoted to the next higher grade, whereas the petitioner has not been promoted.

Learned counsel for the petitioner makes a limited prayer, for time being, to dispose of the petition with a direction to respondent No.2 to dispose of the representation dated 11.10.2006 filed by the petitioner within the stipulated period granted by this Court in accordance with law.

The limited prayer made by the petitioner is not opposed by learned counsel for the State.

The prayer is allowed.

It is directed that, if so advised, the petitioner may file a fresh copy of the representation dated 11.10.2006 (Annexure-P/4) alongwith a copy of this order and the copy of the writ petition before the concerned authority within a period of four weeks from today, and if such a representation is filed, the concerned authority shall dispose of the same as early as possible, preferably within a period of six weeks from the date of filing of the representation before him.

With the above observation, the petition is finally disposed of.

Sd/-
Sunil Kumar Sinha
Judge